

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF GEORGIA**

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

FILE: P.I. Nos.: 0009619, 0009818, 0009819
0009820, 0009821, 0009822
Meriwether/Coweta/Haralson/Carroll/Douglas
Clayton/Peach/Bibb/Twiggs/Bleckley
Dawson/Lumpkin
Cable Barrier Installation Projects **OFFICE:** Engineering Services

DATE: March 25, 2011

FROM: Ronald E. Wishon, State Project Review Engineer *REW*

TO: Bobby K. Hilliard, State Program Delivery Engineer
Attn.: Derrick Cameron

SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF VALUE ENGINEERING STUDY ALTERNATIVES

The VE Study for the above projects was held December 6-9, 2010. Responses were received on March 25, 2011. Recommendations for implementation of Value Engineering Study Alternatives are indicated in the table below. The Project Manager shall incorporate the VE alternatives recommended for implementation to the extent reasonable in the design of the project.

ALT #	Description	Potential Savings/LCC	Implement	Comments
A-1	Use sidewalk concrete in lieu of Class "A" concrete for mowing strip	\$5,240,000	Yes	This will be done.
A-2	Use asphalt in lieu of Class "A" concrete for mowing strip	\$8,110,000	No	During the development of these projects, the Office of Traffic Operations in conjunction with district personnel made a decision to use a concrete mow strip rather than an asphalt mow strip. The number of steps to install the asphalt and subsequently the concrete footing for the cable barrier post would increase the construction time for the installation of the cable barrier system.
A-3	Eliminate the mowing strip	\$12,301,000	No	The Department has documented cable barrier crashes that resulted in the barrier post footing being extracted from the ground. The decision was made to utilize a mow strip with all cable barrier installations to aid in preventing this from happening in Georgia. The mow strip will also prevent vegetation from growing under the cable barrier system, and will allow Maintenance forces to maintain the medians without impacting the cable system.

Cable Barrier Installation Projects
Implementation of Value Engineering Study Alternatives

Page 2

A-4	Use an alternate barrier (instead of a concrete or asphalt mowing strip) to inhibit plant/weed growth	Design Suggestion	No	A mow strip will always be installed with a cable barrier system to prevent extraction of the post footings and to facilitate maintenance of the medians.
A-5	Install posts in driven sleeves without concrete foundations	\$1,223,700	No	The projects are in the May letting and implementation of this recommendation would delay the letting. However, the Office of Traffic Operations will research alternate installation methods that could result in a cost saving and yield the same performance results. Any favorable results may be incorporated into future projects.
B-1	Use a 3 cable system in lieu of a 4 cable system	\$910,000	No	The Cable Barrier specifications will be revised to allow the installation of either a three or four cable system that meets the specified deflection and test level qualifications.
B-2	Shift the location of the barrier to the edge of the shoulder in locations where the shoulders are at least 12 feet wide	\$1,090,000	No	The location of the cable barrier system is selected to prevent errant strikes. Reducing the number of strikes will aid in reducing the number of repairs to the system. The Office of Traffic Operations will consider revising the cable barrier location as the standards are developed and revised for the cable barrier program.
B-4	Use double faced guardrail in lieu of cable system	\$3,174,000	No	The lifecycle cost of the cable barrier system has the potential to result in a cost savings over double faced guardrail. The cable barrier system is distanced from the roadway to minimize errant strikes. If the cable barrier system encounters a strike, it can be repaired by one person within a short time period. Repairing double faced guardrail will typically require a maintenance crew of several people and generally take several days to plan and complete the repair. Crashing into a cable barrier system will typically result in a less severe crash when compared to crashing into a run of double faced guardrail.
B-5	Provide soil boring data in the contract	Design Suggestion	No	There is not enough time to implement this recommendation prior to submitting final plans for these projects; however, this will be considered during the development of cable barrier guidelines.

Cable Barrier Installation Projects
Implementation of Value Engineering Study Alternatives

Page 3

B-6	Develop a performance-based specification	\$1,820,000	No	There is not enough time to implement this recommendation prior to submitting final plans for these projects; however, this will be considered during the development of cable barrier guidelines.
B-7	Verify conformance of projects with AASHTO median barrier installation criteria/guidelines and develop a GDOT implementation plan	\$18,276,000	No	The cable barrier locations were chosen because of the documented crash history. Even though some of the median widths exceed AASHTOs criteria for median barrier, the Project Manager and the Office of Traffic Operations decided to move forward with the projects. The Office of Traffic Operations will develop guidelines to specify the appropriate use of cable barriers.
B-8	Combine projects into one project instead of six projects for bid purposes	\$1,218,000		The Department is in the process of analyzing various cable barrier systems for the purpose of selection one system to specify on all future projects that include installation of cable barrier. FHWA's concurrence will be sought at the end of the evaluation period. The ability to collect data from several cable barrier systems will be possible only if projects are let independently.
B-8.1	GDOT purchase materials on an annual basis and supply materials to the contractors	Design Suggestion	No	Purchasing material in advance of letting a project to construction cannot be implemented until the Department has permission from FHWA to specify one particular cable barrier brand.

The Office of Engineering Services concurs with the Project Manager's responses.

Approved: Gerald M. Ross Date: 31/3/2011
 Gerald M. Ross, PE, Chief Engineer

Approved: Rodney L. Barry Date: 4/20/2011
 for Rodney Barry, PE, FHWA Division Administrator

**Cable Barrier Installation Projects
Implementation of Value Engineering Study Alternatives**

Page 4

REW/LLM

Attachments

c: Angel Correa/Greg Morris/Kendra Bunker/Christy Poon-Atkins/Melinda Roberson - FHWA
Ben Buchan
Bobby Hilliard/Derrick Cameron/Charity Belford/Perry Black
Kathy Zahul/LaKeshia Osborn
Larry Bowman
Randall Davis/Lamar Pruitt/Lee Upkins/Patrick Bowers
Ken Werho
Lisa Myers
Matt Sanders

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

FILE: P.I. No.: 0009619, 0009818, 0009819,
0009820, 0009821, 0009822

Cable Barrier Installation

OFFICE: Program Delivery

DATE: 24 March 2011

FROM: Bobby K. Hilliard, PE, State Program Delivery Engineer *B.K.H.*

TO: Ronald E. Wishon, State Project Review Engineer
Attn.: Lisa Myers

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO VALUE ENGINEERING STUDY ALTERNATIVES

Below are the responses for the Value Engineering Study dated 21 December 2010.

Recommendation Highlights

A: Class "A" Concrete Mow Strip

A-1: Use sidewalk concrete in lieu of Class A concrete.

The total potential savings is \$5,240,000

Yes. We agree with this recommendation and will revise the plans accordingly.

A-2: Use asphalt in lieu of Class A concrete proposed under the current design for the mow strip.

The total potential savings is \$8,110,000

No. The Office of Traffic Operations in conjunction with District personnel made a prior decision not to install an asphalt mow strip due to the installation process. It was determined the number of steps to install the asphalt and subsequently the concrete footing for the cable barrier post would be a considerable increase in construction time.

A-3: Eliminate mowing strip completely.

The total potential savings is \$12,301,000

No. The Department has documented cable barrier crashes that resulted in the barrier post footing being extracted from the ground. Although this rare, the decision was made to utilize a mow strip with all cable barrier installations to aid in preventing this from happening in Georgia. The mow strip will also prevent vegetation from growing under the cable barrier system. This will allow Maintenance forces to maintain the medians without impacting the cable system.

A-4: Design Consideration: Use an alternate barrier for weed / plant growth.
The total potential savings is N/A

No. This recommendation will not be implemented because a mow strip will always be installed with a cable barrier system.

A-5: Drive posts and or sleeves and eliminate concrete foundation.
The total potential savings is \$1,223,700

No. This recommendation will not be implemented due to the subject projects being in the May 2011 Letting. There is not enough time to complete the research and revise the specifications and details. However, the Office of Traffic Operations will research alternate installation methods that could result in a cost saving and yield the same performance results.

B: Cable Barrier Systems

B-1: Use a three cable system in lieu of a four cable system.
The total potential savings is \$910,000

No. The Cable Barrier Specifications will be revised to allow the installation of either a three cable or a four cable system. The approved cable barrier system will be required to meet the specified deflection and test level qualifications.

B-2: Shift the location of the barrier to the edge of the shoulder where the shoulders are at least 12 feet wide.
The total potential savings is \$1,090,000

No. The location of the cable barrier system is to prevent errant strikes. Reducing the number of strikes will aid in reducing the number of repairs to the system. The Office of Traffic Operations will consider revising the cable barrier location as they re-evaluate and develop standards for the cable barrier program.

B-4: Use dual faced guardrail in lieu of cable system.
The total potential savings is \$3,174,000

No. The lifecycle cost of the cable barrier system has the potential to result in a cost saving over double faced guardrail. The cable barrier system is distanced from the roadway to minimize errant strikes. If the cable barrier system encounters a strike, it can be repaired by one person within a short time period. Repairing double faced guardrail will typically require a maintenance crew of several people and generally take several days to plan and complete the repair. Crashing into a cable barrier system will typically result in a less severe crash when compared to crashing into a run of double faced guardrail.

B-5: Design consideration: Provide soil boring data of the terminal areas to the contractors prior to bid.

The total potential savings is N/A

No. Providing soil data will be considered during the development of cable barrier guidelines. There was not enough time to implement this recommendation prior to submitting final plans.

B-6: Develop a performance based specification.

The total potential savings is \$1,820,000

No. Developing a performance based specification will be considered during the development of cable barrier guidelines. There was not enough time to re-write the specifications prior to submitting final plans.

B-7: Verify conformance of projects with AASHTO median barrier installation guidelines and develop a GDOT implementation plan.

The total potential savings is \$18,276,000

No. The cable barrier locations were chosen because of the documented crash history. Even though some of the median widths exceed AASHTOs criteria for median barrier, the Project Manager and the Office of Traffic Operations decided to move forward with the projects. The Office of Traffic Operations will develop guidelines to better specify the use of cable barrier.

B-8: Combine projects for bid purposes.

The total potential savings is \$1,218,000

No. The Department is in the process of analyzing various cable barrier systems for the purpose of selecting one system to specify on all future projects proposing the installation of cable barrier. We will seek FHWA's concurrence at the end of the evaluation period. The ability to collect data from several cable barrier systems will be possible through Letting independent projects.

B-8.1: Design consideration: Pre-purchase materials on an annual or semi-annual basis.

Potential savings TBD

No. Purchasing material in advance of Letting a project to construction cannot be implemented until the Department has permission from FHWA to specify one particular cable barrier brand. The Department will run the risk of not being able to utilize the purchased material because each cable system has the potential to be slightly different.

If you have any questions, please contact Derrick Cameron, Project Manager at 404-631-1223.

PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:0009619,0009818,0009820,0009821,0009822

PROJ ID :	0009819	I-675 FROM HENRY CO LINE TO DEKALB CO LINE - CABLE BARRIERS				MGMT LET DATE :	05/20/2011							
COUNTY :	Clayton	MPO:	Atlanta TMA	PRIORITY CODE:	6133	MGMT ROW DATE :								
LENGTH (MI)	7.61	TIP #:	AR-118	DOT DIST:	7	BASELINE LET DATE:	05/20/2011							
PROJ NO.:		MODEL YR.:		CONG. DIST:	13	SCHED LET DATE :	5/13/2011							
PROJ MGR:	Cameron, Derrick	TYPE WORK:	Barriers	BIKE:	N	WHO LETS?:	GDOT Let							
AODH Initials:	SSH	CONCEPT:		MEASURE:	E	LET WITH :								
OFFICE :	Program Delivery	PROG TYPE:	Safety	NEEDS SCORE:										
CONSULTANT:	No Consultant, GDOT In-House Design	Prov. for ITS:	N	BRIDGE SUFF:										
SPONSOR :		BOND PROJ:												
DESIGN FIRM:	GDOT Traffic Ops D Cameron													
BASE	BASE	LATE	LATE	TASKS'	ACTUAL START	ACTUAL FINISH	%	PROGRAMMED FUNDS						
START	FINISH	START	FINISH					Activity	Approved	Proposed	Cost	Fund	Status	Date Auth
7/26/2010	9/8/2010	4/14/2011	4/14/2011	Value Engineering Study	9/12/2010	8/6/2010	83	PE	2010	2010	30,000.00	LS30	AUTHORIZED	4/27/2010
4/29/2010	9/22/2010			Environmental Approval	3/15/2010	5/28/2010	100	CST	2011	1,385,277.60	1,385,277.60	1,385,277.60	AUTHORIZED	3/18/2011
9/9/2010	12/15/2010			Preliminary Plans										
1/13/2011	1/13/2011			PFPR Inspection	1/28/2011	1/28/2011	100							
Activity	Cost Estimate Amount	Date	Activity	Cost	Cost	Stip Amounts								
PE	\$30,000.00	2/1/2010	PE	0.00	LS30									
CST	\$1,385,277.60	2/1/2010	CST	0.00	LS30									
District Comments														
Bridge:	NO BRIDGE REQUIRED													
EIS:	PCEA/Avd 8.6.10 PI #009819 Cert for MAY'11 Let 2.4.11 [LB 3.31.11]													
LGPA:	NOT APPLICABLE													
Programming:	PE(LS 0006132)CHANGED TO EXEMPT - NOT ON FHWA LIST 12-20-2010 EXEMPT CONFIRMED BY FHWA I-26-2011 [LS 0006133													
Traffic Op:	clb. submitted PSE on 3-1-11													
UST:	MC													
Utility:	YPF: req project info / 11,Email PFPR 1/28/11													
Prel. Parcel C/F:	0	Total Parcel in ROW System:		Cond. Filed:										
Under Review:		Options - Pending:		Relocations:										
Released:		Condemnations- Pend:		Acquired:										
				Acquired by:										
				Acquisition MGR:										
				R/W Cert Date:										
				2/21/11										
					DEEDS CT:									

PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:0009619,0009818,0009820,0009821,0009822

PROJ ID :	0009822	SR 400 FM FORSYTH CO LINE TO S OF CR 145 - CABLE BARRIER										MGMT LET DATE :	09/16/2011	
COUNTY :	Dawson, Lumpkin											MGMT ROW DATE :		
LENGTH (MI)	10.30											BASELINE LET DATE:	09/16/2011	
PROJ NO.:												SCHED LET DATE :	10/14/2011	
PROJ MGR:	Cameron, Derrick											WHO LETS? :	GDOT Let	
AOHD Initials:	SSH											LET WITH:		
OFFICE:	Program Delivery											MEASURE:	E	
CONSULTANT:	No Consultant, GDOT In-House Design											NEEDS SCORE:		
SPONSOR :	GDOT											BRIDGE SUFF:		
DESIGN FIRM:	GDOT Traffic Ops D Cameron											BOND PROJ :		
BASE	BASE	LASTE	START	FINISH	LATE	TASKS	ACTUAL	START	ACTUAL	FINISH	%	ACTIVITY	APPROVED	PROPOSED
3/29/2010	5/12/2010	4/14/2011	Value Engineering Study	9/12/2010	83			9/12/2010	2010	PE		Date Auth		
3/26/2010	8/5/2010	4/14/2011	Environmental Approval	3/18/2010	100			3/18/2010	LUMP	LUMP				
3/26/2010	2/1/2011	4/15/2011	Preliminary Plans	0								AUTHORIZED	3/30/2010	
3/2/2011	3/2/2011	8/4/2011	PFPR Inspection	1/28/2011	100			1/28/2011				PRECST		
Activity	Cost Estimate Amount	Date	Activity	Cost	Fund	Status	Acquired by:	DEEDS CT:	PROGRAMMED FUNDS					
PE	\$30,000.00	2/1/2010	PE	30,000.00	LS30									
CST	\$1,428,000.00	2/1/2010	CST	1,428,000.00	LS30									
District Comments														
Bridge:	NO BRIDGE REQUIRED													
Design:	In preparing plans for VE study on DEC 6-9 2010 (10/4/10) PCEApvd 08.06.2010(Cert for Let10.7.10P1 #0009822)(On Schedule SEP 11 letLB 3.31.11													
EIS:	NOT APPLICABLE													
IGPA:	Programming: PE LS 0006.132(ANGED TO EXEMPT PER FHWA 9-20-2010													
Programming:	(In) working on plans 9/4/10													
Traffic Op:	Clear 12-29-10													
Utility:														
Prel. Parcel CT:	0	Total Parcel in ROW System:	Cond. Filed:											
Under Review:		Options - Pending:	Relocations:											
Released:		Condemnations- Pend:	Acquired:											
			N/R											

PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:0009619,0009818,0009820,0009821,0009822

I-20 FROM ALABAMA STATE LINE TO W OF SR 5 - CABLE BARRIERS											
PROJ ID :	0009818	COUNTY :	Carroll, Douglas, Haralson	MPO:	Atlanta TMA, Not Urban	PRIORITY CODE:	6133	MGMT LET DATE :	09/16/2011		
LENGTH (MI)	34.03	PROJ NO.:		TIP #:		DOT DIST:	6, 7	MGMT ROW DATE :			
PROJ MGR:	Cameron, Derrick	AQHD Initials:	SSH	MODEL YR :		CONG. DIST:	3, 11, 13	BASELINE LET DATE :	09/16/2011		
OFFICE:	Program Delivery	CONSULTANT:	No Consultant, GDOT In-House Design	TYPE WORK:	Barriers	BIKE:	N	SCHED LET DATE :	6/24/2011		
SPONSOR :	GDOT	DESIGN FIRM:	GDOT Traffic Ops D Cameron	CONCEPT:		MEASURE:	E	WHO LETS?:	GDOT Let		
BOND PROJ:		PROG TYPE:	Safety	Prov. for ITS:	N <th>NEEDS SCORE:</th> <td></td> <th>LET WITH :</th> <td></td>	NEEDS SCORE:		LET WITH :			
BRIDGE SUFF:		Prov. for ITS:			<th></th> <td><th></th><td></td></td>		<th></th> <td></td>				
BASE	BASE	LATE	LATE	TASKS	ACTUAL START	ACTUAL FINISH	%	PROGRAMMED FUNDS			
START	FINISH	START	FINISH		9/12/2010	8/6/2010	83	Activity	Approved		
9/9/2010	10/25/2010	4/14/2011	4/14/2011	Value Engineering Study	3/18/2010	8/6/2010	100	PE	2010		
5/10/2010	7/9/2010			Environmental Approval	2/8/2010	6/4/2010	100	LUMP	30,000.00		
10/26/2010	4/13/2011			Preliminary Plans	1/28/2011	1/28/2011	100	CST	5,706,900.00		
5/12/2011	5/12/2011			PFPR Inspection					LS30		
								Cost Estimate Amount	STIP AMOUNTS		
Activity	Amount	Fund	Status	Date	Cost	Cost	Fund	Date Auth			
PE	\$30,000.00	LS30	AUTHORIZED	2/1/2010	0.00	0.00	LS30	4/20/2010			
CST	\$5,595,000.00	LS30	PRECST	2/1/2010	0.00	0.00	LS30				
Bridge:											
NO BRIDGE REQUIRED								District Comments			
EIS:	PCEIA(pd 08.06.2010 PI#4009818) OnScheduleSEP11 left B 3.31.11										
LGPA:	NOT APPLICABLE										
Programming:	PE LS 0006132 CHANGED TO EXEMPT PER FHWA 9-20-2010										
Traffic Op:	LO: VE Study scheduled for December 6, 2010										
Utility:	YFF: Email PFPR 1/28/11 ; 01/31										
Prel. Parcel CT:	0	Total Parcel in ROW System:		Cond. Filed:				DEEDS CT:			
Under Review:		Options Pending:		Relocations:				Acquired by:			
Released:		Condemnations- Pend:		Acquired:				Acquisition MGR:			
								R/W Cert Date:			

PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:0009619,0009818,0009819,0009820,0009821,0009822

PROJ ID:	0009619	Coweta, Meriwether			I-85 FROM CR 417/MERIWETHER TO 1.25 MI N OF CR 201/COWETA			PRIORITY CODE:	6133	MGMT LET DATE :	05/20/2011
COUNTY:		LENGTH (MI):	6.40	MPO:	Atlanta TMA, Not Urban	TIP #:		DOT DIST:	3	MGMT ROW DATE :	05/20/2011
PROJ NO.:		PROJ MGR:	Cameron, Derrick	MODEL YR.:		CONG. DIST:	3	SCHED LET DATE :	7/15/2011		
AHD Initials:	SSH	OFFICE:	Program Delivery	TYPE WORK:	Barriers	BIKE:	N	WHO LET'S?:	GDOT Let		
CONSULTANT:	No Consultant, GDOT In-House Design	SPONSOR :	GDOT	CONCEPT:	CABLE BARRIER	MEASURE:	E	LET WITH :			
DESIGN FIRM:	GDOT Traffic Ops D Cameron	PROG TYPE:	Safety	NEEDS SCORE:		BRIDGE SUFF:					
BOND PROJ.:		Prov. for ITS:	N								
BASE	BASE	LATE	LATE	TASKS	ACTUAL START	ACTUAL FINISH	%	ACTIVITY	APPROVED	PROPOSED	PROGRAMMED FUNDS
START	FINISH	START	FINISH		9/12/2010	1/18/2011	83	Activity	Approved	Proposed	Cost Fund
8/16/2010	9/29/2010	11/24/2010	4/14/2011	Value Engineering Study	1/19/2010	1/18/2011	100	PE	2010	2010	75,000.00 LS30 AUTHORIZED
12/23/2010	12/23/2010		4/14/2011	Environmental Approval	12/31/2009	75		CST	2011	1,101,963.45	1,101,963.45 LS30 AUTH-PEND
				Preliminary Plans	1/28/2011	100					
				PFPR Inspection							
Activity	Cost Estimate Amount	Date	Activity	Cost	Fund	Status	Date Auth				
PE	\$75,000.00	10/7/2009	PE	0.00	LS30		11/16/2009				
CST	\$1,101,963.45	10/7/2009	CST	0.00	LS30						
District Comments											
Bridge:	NO BRIDGE REQUIRED										
Design:	LO: Working on PFPR Request										
EIS:	PCEApdv 3.18 10/cent MAY'11 Let 1.18.11 LB 3.31.11										
L GPA:	NOT APPLICABLE										
Prog. Develop:	CABLE BARRIERS										
Programming:	PE LS 0006132 CHANGED TO EXEMPT PER FHWA 10-12-2010 CHANGED TO FOS PER FHWA										
Traffic Op:	12-20-2010 LS 0006133										
Utility:	VE Study Held December 6, 2010										
EMG:	12/10: No utility involvement anticipated										
NOT APPLICABLE											
Prel. Parcel CT:	0	Total Parcel in ROW System:						Acquired by:	N/R		
Under Review:		Options - Pending:						Acquisition MGR:			
Released:		Condemnations- Pend:						R/W Cert Date:	2/21/11		
		Cond. Filed:						DEEDS CT:			
		Relocations:									
		Acquired:									

PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:0009619,0009818,0009820,0009821,0009822

PROJ ID :	0009820		I-75 FM HOUSTON CO LINE TO CRAWFORD CO LINE - CABLE BARRIERS										MGMT LET DATE :	05/20/2011	
COUNTY :	Peach		MPO:	Warner Robins		PRIORITY CODE:	6133		MGMT ROW DATE :						
LENGTH (MI)	11.12		TIP #:			DOT DIST:	3		BASELINE LET DATE:	05/20/2011					
PROJ NO.:	Cameron, Derrick		MODEL YR :			CONG. DIST:	2		SCHED LET DATE :	7/15/2011					
PROJ MGR.:	SSH		TYPE WORK:	Barrers		BIKE:	N		WHO LETS?:	GDOT Let					
AOHD Initials:			CONCEPT:			MEASURE:	E		LET WITH:						
OFFICE :	Program Delivery		PROG TYPE:	Safety		NEEDS SCORE:									
CONSULTANT:	No Consultant, GDOT In-House Design		Prov. for ITS:	N		BRIDGE SUFF:									
SPONSOR :	GDOT		BOND PROJ :												
DESIGN FIRM:	GDOT Traffic Ops D Cameron														
BASE	BASE	LAST	LATE	FINISH	TASKS	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	%	PROGRAMMED FUNDS						
START	FINISH	START	END	FINISH		START	FINISH		Activity	Approved	Proposed	Cost	Fund	Status	Date Auth
6/24/2010	8/9/2010	8/27/2010	4/14/2011	Value Engineering Study		9/12/2010	83		PE	2010	2010	30,000.00	LS30	AUTHORIZED	4/27/2010
5/3/2010	8/2/2010	8/27/2010	4/14/2011	Environmental Approval		3/18/2010	100		CST	2011	2011	627,165.00	LS30	AUTH-PEND	
8/10/2010	12/1/2010	12/15/2010	4/14/2011	Preliminary Plans		3/16/2010	90								
1/13/2011	1/13/2011			PPFR Inspection		1/28/2011	100								
District Comments															
Bridge:	NO BRIDGE REQUIRED														
Design:	Inp: VE study Held DEC 6-9-2010														
EIS:	PCEApvd 8.6.10 PI #009820[Cert for MAY'11 Let 2.4.1][LB 3.31.11]														
LGPA:	NOT APPLICABLE														
Programming:	PE LS 0006132[CHANGED TO EXEMPT - NOT ON FHWA LIST 12-20-2010]EXEMPT CONFIRMED BY FHWA 1-26-2011[LS 0006133														
Traffic Op:	(Inp) Working on PPFR plans 9/4/10														
EMG:	NOT APPLICABLE														
Prel. Parcel CT:	0	Total Parcel in ROW System:			Cond. Filed:			DEEDS CT:							
Under Review:	Options Pending:				Relocations:										
Released:	Condemnations- Pend:				Acquired:										
					Acquired by:										
					Acquisition MGR:										
					R/W Cert Date:										
					2/21/11										

PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:0009619,0009818,0009819,0009820,0009821,0009822

PROJ ID :	I-16 FROM SR 87/BIBB TO CR 96/LAURENS - CABLE BARRIERS												MGMT LET DATE :	05/20/2011				
COUNTY :	Bibb, Bleckley, Laurens, Twiggs	MPO:	Macon, Not Urban	PRIORITY CODE:	6133	MGMT ROW DATE :												
LENGTH (MI)	63.71	TIP #:		DOT DIST:	3	BASELINE LET DATE:	05/20/2011											
PROJ NO.:		MODEL YR :		CONG. DIST:	8	SCHED LET DATE :	5/13/2011											
PROJ MGR:	Cameron, Derrick	TYPE WORK:	Barriers	BIKE:	N	WHO LETS?:	GDOT Let											
AODH Initials:	SSH	CONCEPT:		MEASURE:	E	LET WITH :												
OFFICE :	Program Delivery	PROG TYPE:	Safety	NEEDS SCORE:														
CONSULTANT:	No Consultant, GDOT In-House Design	Prov. for ITS:	N	BRIDGE SUFF:														
SPONSOR :	GDOT	BOND PROJ :																
DESIGN FIRM:	GDOT Traffic Ops D Cameron																	
BASE	BASE	LATE	LATE	TASKS'	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	%	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	FINISH	START	ACTIVITY	APPROVED	PROPOSED	PROGRAMMED FUNDS			
START	FINISH	START	FINISH		9/12/2010	3/18/2010	83	PE	2010	2/3/2011	100	Activity	Approved	Proposed	Cost	Fund	Status	Date Auth
6/17/2010	8/2/2010	8/17/2010	4/14/2011	Value Engineering Study	3/18/2010	3/1/2010	100	PE	2010	85,000.00	1,530	AUTHORIZED	4/20/2010					
5/5/2010				Environmental Approval	3/1/2010	1/28/2011	100	CST	2011	8,653,561.30	1,530	AUTHORIZED	3/18/2011					
8/3/2010	12/15/2010	4/14/2011		Preliminary Plans														
				PFPR Inspection														
1/13/2011	1/13/2011																	
Activity	Cost Estimate	Amount	Date	Activity	Cost	Cost	STIP AMOUNTS											
PE	\$85,000.00		2/1/2010	PE	0.00	0.00												
CST	\$8,653,561.30		11/1/2010	CST	0.00	1,530												
Bridge: NO BRIDGE REQUIRED															District Comments			
Design:	PB: 12-15-10 Working on PFPR Submission Package														[4-16-10] OCT WILL BE DIFFICULT IF MOVEMENT NOT MADE SOON			
EIS:	PCEApd 8.6.10PI #0009821 Cert for MAY'11 Let 2.4.11 LB 3.31.11																	
LCPA:	NOT APPLICABLE														PB: revised cost estimate-CST:\$11,750,445.58; 10-4-10			
Prog. Develop:	PE LS 0006132 CHANGED TO EXEMPT PER FHWA 9-20-2010#1 10-2010 LS 0006133																	
Traffic Op:	PB: VE study, plans, and env cert complete																	
EMG:	NOT APPLICABLE																	
Prel. Parcel CT:	0	Total Parcel in ROW System:		Cond. Filed:											Acquired by:	N/R		
Under Review:		Options - Pending:		Relocations:											Acquisition MGR:			
Released:		Condemnations- Pend:		Acquired:											R/W Cert Date:	2/21/11		